

**LEN WARFE – VERBAL SUBMISSION TO PANEL HEARING 26TH
AUGUST 2003 – PLANNING SCHEME AMMENDMENT C52 AND
PLANNING APPLICATION CPO2/003**

Good Afternoon.

Photo No. 1

This photo shows the site of the proposed amendment and where it sits amongst our unique coast and clifftop residential area.

At last we have the opportunity to implement our Planning Scheme as intended for the last 40 years in this important area. I have lived in the area for 56 years, so I've been waiting a long time to see the area in the condition it deserves to be in. The previous Engineering works, garage and the petrol station were, and are, all **non-conforming uses**. None of these uses, for the entire 40 years of the Planning Scheme, have been judged suitable or appropriate use of the land. The 'opportunity' to operate a business in this area has only ever existed because a business was there before we had a planning scheme - before we cared about where we put things! It is now the 21st Century; and it is time to get things right in our environment.

I also travelled through McCrae every day on my way to school, and always appreciated the remarkable features of the area. I am also a member of several local conservation groups, including the McCrae group which works in the Conservation Zone opposite this proposed development. I am extremely attached to this beautiful area.

Unfortunately, and to my amazement however we have been presented with this proposed 'mini' township within our unique coastal and clifftop residential area. I am also concerned by the Developer's Planners claim that he has undertaken 'exhaustive consultations' with Council to reach this stage. It seems that private interests have greater access to our Council than those of us who are interested in preserving public assets do, and we are left to wonder why, and who Council acts for.

I would now like to discuss the Planning Scheme and it's supporting documents to show the many sections which clearly support retention of the DDO3 for this area. I'll also make some responses to the Developer's Planner's Report.

Firstly, I would like to clarify whether we are considering **Lot numbers 611- 613 or 611- 615**. This is unclear as the Developer's Planner's report refers to both at different sections of his report.

Firstly, our Local policy: the Municipal Strategic Statement Clause 21.08 Foreshores and Coastal areas. Key issues include:

Objective 1: To protect and enhance the natural ecosystems and landscapes of the coast for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations.

Strategies include the 2 points:

- Contain development in coastal locations to existing settlements, avoiding further linear development along the coast, and where necessary, restructure old and inappropriate subdivisions, and secondly
- Ensure that new construction and development on the coast is designed on the basis of a site and landscape analysis, which takes account of the scenic and visual qualities of the foreshore and coastal areas.

This amendment however seeks to **extend** development in a coastal location beyond existing settlement boundaries, and to **extend** further linear development along the coast. This location has dramatic coast and landscape scenery - the craggy granite cliff at Anthony's Nose, and the vegetated cliff behind the proposed development, and the beautiful foreshore and beach.

The developer seems to ignore these outstanding features of the area, (except when **marketing** his development). The eventual outcome of this proposed amendment would be the destruction of the very features the MSS seeks to preserve.

Policies and the exercise of discretion include:

- Apply a **precautionary approach to decision making**, ensuring that the environmental effects of both the construction and operation of a proposed development are assessed as part of the approval process. New development proposals should respect natural coastal systems and should include an assessment of vulnerability to climate change effects.

This raises some very important issues, which suggest that the precautionary approach would be to disallow this amendment. Increasing housing density below a steep, unstable cliff face which is already at some risk of slippage is **not cautious, it is careless**. Increasing residential density and traffic along Pt. Nepean Rd. will only provide negative environmental effects for the coast.

However, it is the issue of groundwater and sea level rise which I want to examine more fully.

I have observed the level of the groundwater on this site during excavation of the fuel tanks – the water is tidal and very close to ground level. (**Hand out printed photo**)

With Sea level rise, groundwater will rise, - a problem for building foundations. For this reason alone, we should be reducing the amount of development near the coast, and moving development inland when the opportunity arises- as we have with this site. An alternative development outcome for the site

would be acquisition by government for provision of car parking for beach users, which is somewhat limited at present. As the site has frontage to a road on three sides, it is particularly suitable, providing drive through access.

With a good revegetation program, the site could look quite attractive and future groundwater water problems more easily managed. This would also be in line with the recommendations of the CAP 2021. Brian Haritsis, the major author of the CAP stated in a CAP public information session at Rosebud Council chambers some months ago, that: *unless we want our beautiful foreshore to end up paved over like St. Kilda and Elwood, we must progressively remove car parking from the foreshore, and move it inland by acquiring inland parking sites.* This site provides an excellent opportunity to implement one of the most important recommendations of the CAP and the VCS.

I am the senior Vice President of the Port Phillip Conservation Council Inc., an umbrella group of Bay wide conservation groups with some 5000 members. The PPCC endorses the CAP. PPCC also has a long-standing policy of removal of foreshore carparks to sites further inland. We see this site as an excellent opportunity to exercise this policy. Copy of PPCC policy provided.

I note the Developer's Planner's Report (p38) refers to the then as yet unmet EPA requirement **to develop a plan for monitoring and management of the contaminated groundwater**. Peninsula Planning Consultants advised in their letter of 11th August 2003 that the '**Statement of Environmental Audit**' will be issued by 15th August and available to the Panel at the commencement of the Hearing. As an objector, this report has not been available to me until today, and I have not been able to assess it. The following comments are therefore based on my own knowledge of the area, and my broader concerns about groundwater pollution.

If there is contaminated groundwater, why are we planning to put 7 families on top of it? A relevant article in the Age, Saturday 23rd August 2003 confirms that the former ICI, now Orica, has spent \$10 million cleaning up their Botany site in NSW— only to find that recent testing reveals far more contamination than originally estimated. Government has now demanded further treatment of the site, at an as yet unknown -open ended cost - estimated at many times the original \$10 million.

A rising water table, especially a contaminated one, is a significant environmental and building issue, which does not seem to have been adequately addressed for this site and its medium density housing proposal:

- ☐ Did groundwater testing determine the **extent** of the 'plume' of contamination from the site?
- ☐ How was it determined where groundwater testing should stop and start?
- ☐ Have adjoining properties had their groundwater tested for contamination or did the testing stop at the fence line of 611 –613 Pt. Nepean Rd?
- ☐ If testing didn't occur outside the title boundaries, why not? As the site is subject to tidal influences, as with the Orica Botany site, and as my photo

demonstrates, there is no reason to believe the contamination wouldn't have spread.

- Is the current land owner/developer assuming responsibility for any possible future contamination discoveries and clean-up on site, or does this liability transfer to the new title holders of the 7 units at 611-613 Pt. Nepean Rd?
- How are adjoining landowners placed if contamination is discovered in their property, especially after the current developer/ title holder of this proposed development has departed?

Other aspects of water management related to Climate change will be discussed later.

Objective 2: to achieve coordinated development of public and private facilities that increases the sustainable, social, economic and recreational value of the coast and foreshore to the community.

Strategies include:

- Ensure that coastal development is designed and constructed in a manner which respects and enhances the coastal environment and the experience and enjoyment of the coast by the community.

Increased housing density along this scenic route will not enhance the coastal environment. It will provide a sprawling urban backdrop, reducing the experience and enjoyment of the coast. Higher density housing would contribute to more traffic and less accessibility to the coast, and mean higher user demands on the foreshore, making it less enjoyable and more expensive to maintain.

Road traffic densities on Pt. Nepean Rd. are increasing markedly all year round, in line with the property and population boom on the Peninsula, and Council's ceaseless promotion of tourism.

Policy and the exercise of discretion includes:

- Ensuring that structures are sited and designed to integrate and compliment the surrounding coastal landscape in accordance with Landscape Setting Types for the Victorian Coast (1998)

Increasing linear development along the coast will detract from coastal scenery and amenity. Developing the site in accordance with the current controls, by constructing two well-designed coastal homes in this unique coastal location would achieve this outcome.

Secondly, Design and Development Overlay 3 (DDO3)

Our focus should be on why, for 40 years this area has, and still is considered worthy of protection first as 'Residential A' then 'Hillside Residential' and now DDO3 - Coast and Landscape Design.

I believe the natural features of the site and surrounding area clearly demonstrate WHY DDO3 IS still appropriate and always will be.

Design objectives of DDO3 include:

- ☐ *To avoid higher densities of development in areas subject to instability, erosion*

An examination of the DDO3's across the Shire reveals that interfaces between DDO's have been chosen in line with specific topographical or other important features. Ad hoc changes to these defined boundaries would eventually obliterate the intent of the DDO's.

Photos 2 and 3

The proposed amendment is in an area well known for its instability. There have been several landslips in the surrounding area in recent years. Pt. Nepean Rd at Anthony's Nose, a few hundred metres to the east had to be permanently re-aligned after a severe land slippage in 1995.

Photo 4 - Article about landslip

A house at 565 Pt. Nepean Rd. (only a few hundred metres to the East of the proposed site) required evacuation after a landslip in 1996. The topography of the area immediately to the rear of this proposal is steep, very similar to the where the landslip occurred.

Heavy rain, a water overflow or landslip event in any of the houses above in Viewpoint Rd. could create a serious problem below in the vicinity of the proposed amendment, just like this incident in 1996.

- ☐ *To ensure that the new development has proper regard for the established streetscape and development pattern in terms of building height, scale and siting*

The established streetscape does not include ANY units from Foote St. Dromana to at least Bartels St. McCrae, west of McCrae shopping centre – a distance of perhaps 4 kms! How can the proposed development possibly meet this objective? It can't!

- ☐ *To recognise areas where a lower intensity of residential activity and traffic movement contributes to the amenity of the area.*

McCrae is one of the most popular family beaches on the Peninsula – with high usage all summer, and is well used all year for walking and sight- seeing. The topography of the area, its proximity to the Conservation Zone of the McCrae foreshore and the beautiful McCrae beach - means that the area needs less traffic, and less residential activity, not more. The threat of even **more** people and **more** activity if the “**opportunity to infill**” is allowed must surely reduce the amenity of the area.

DDO 3 Decision guidelines include:

The RA must consider:

- *The effect of any development on the environmental and landscape values of site and the local area, including the effects on streamlines, foreshores, areas of remnant vegetation, areas prone to erosion and on the amenity and accessibility of areas of public open space.*

All other homes in this DDO3 area are detached and on large allotments. This proposal would introduce a style and size which will not match the environmental or landscape value of the area, setting a precedent for more medium or high density housing. The Developer's April 2002 and August 2003 Planning Report (page 7) confirms that a review of the broader precinct is warranted. Clearly if this proposal was approved, this developer or any other developer for that matter, would seek to have the broader precinct reviewed. The logic used to approve this proposal would be applied to justify further extension of unit development in the area, as clearly supported by the Developer. This would impose even greater strain on the environment, reduce amenity and expose more residents to the threat of land slippage and erosion.

Secondly, Council's proposal to apply a *Development Plan Overlay* to the proposed development site.

Council's proposal to apply a DPO rather than DDO1 is equally unacceptable. By definition the DPO will be designed to accommodate and **condone** an intensive development within the boundaries of this scenic, sensitive, environmentally significant area, which for the very reasons of its uniqueness has rightly had 'Residential A', 'Hillside residential' or DDO3 applied to it ever since we've had a Planning Scheme. This outcome is no better environmentally or socially than the Developer's proposal to convert the site to a DDO1.

As a community, even if a DPO was applied we would still be left with the following unacceptable outcomes:

- **Overdevelopment** – if DPO was applied to this section of land there would be no logical reason for a DPO being refused for any of the lots between Margaret St. McCrae and Anthony's Nose Dromana. On what basis could Council or government **legally** argue that any other two blocks could not have the same consideration given to them as has been given to this Developer?
- **Erosion** – increased population density will inevitably place strain on the topography of the area. Stormwater run off from clifftop properties, more foot traffic and changes to vegetation will contribute to erosion, and land slippage. More residents will be exposed to risk of landslips. More foreshore damage and erosion will occur.

- **Loss of amenity** – If higher density development commenced along this section of Pt. Nepean Rd., foreshore users would have reduced access to the foreshore, whilst road traffic, parking problems and numbers of beach users would increase. Destruction of the foreshore by overuse and foreshore vegetation removal by residents in the pursuit of views would also occur, all resulting in a net loss to the community, and long term unsustainable outcome for the beach and foreshore.

I would now like to show you some photos of recent Banksia destruction within the Rosebud foreshore just west of McCrae, but still within the same 'Management Zone' as the McCrae foreshore.

Photos 5,6,7,8,9,10,11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18

This appalling crime occurred where newly constructed two storey units on the foreshore are the direct beneficiaries of the supposedly 'improved view'. This anti-social behaviour is an ongoing problem on foreshore reserves, and invariably occurs with changes in ownership to nearby properties, when new owners believe they have the right to commit these crimes against the community for their own personal gain. There is absolutely no reason to believe that new owners of the 7 proposed units would act differently to any other property owner living near the foreshore who has decided to destroy public property to get a "better view" – whilst destroying ancient indigenous trees which native fauna has relied on for habitat since time immemorial.

- **And lastly, Loss of landscape and environmental values** – Increased housing density will mean tourists and the general community will lose the landscape values currently on offer in this dramatic section of coastal scenery. Residents in Viewpoint Rd. McCrae and Clifftop Crt. Dromana will certainly lose one of the most captivating features of their present viewlines. In future they would look down on a Gold Coast or Hong Kong type conglomeration of rooftops. I also know many boat owners and sailors who say that from the Bay, the view of increasing development along our coast is ruining our once beautiful shoreline.

Fourth, Victorian Coastal Strategy 2002

Built Environment & Coastal Infrastructure (pp 39-40)

5.2.2. The essential character of coastal settlements, undisturbed areas between settlements and the developed coast will be protected through mechanisms such as the development of local guidelines and planning scheme overlays, for the siting and design of structures on the coast.

Local guidelines and planning scheme overlays have been developed, and they prescribe that housing density should be kept to a minimum. And,

*5.2.3 The planned growth of coastal towns will be managed through the **establishment of township boundaries in planning schemes**. This will ensure that growth in coastal areas is planned, coastal values protected*

(environmental, scenic, cultural) and the needs of future generations respected.

Township boundaries have been established for McCrae, only about 4 years ago. Creating another pocket sized township boundary within the surrounding DDO3 will directly contradict the intent of the VCS. And....

*5.2.4 Planning schemes will be the primary tool used to **avoid proliferation of development outside existing settlements....and inappropriate developments within existing settlements***

5.2.9 Opportunities will be actively sought to restructure old and inappropriate subdivisions where identified conflicts with coastal vulnerability and environmental values can be reduced.

Coastal and environmental values would be **further reduced** by application of a DPO rather than DDO3 in this area. Only by retaining the DDO3 can we be **assured** that the environmental and coastal values of the area will remain intact.

Photo 19

Coastal vulnerability: climate change and sea level rise are significant issues for this coastal hinterland. Sea level rise, as a consequence of global warming is now well accepted. As warmer water expands, more water will be available on every tide and during storm surges – causing more erosion and retreat of the land. CSIRO predict a 17 cm sea level rise by 2030, some predictions are as high as 1 metre by 2045. These figures are taken from 'Making the most of the Bay' Prepared for the Ministry of Planning and Environment 1988.

I'll now provide you with a diagram from this publication of coastal areas predicted to be submerged around Port Phillip Bay as a result of a 1 metre rise in the water level in the Bay. This site at McCrae is included in this prediction. Refer back to the photograph I showed of the groundwater level at the site during excavation of the petrol tank to see how close the natural ground level the existing subsoil (Tidal) water level is – it is clearly less than a metre.

Add to this the current State government proposal to deepen The Heads and the Shipping channels in the Bay, and we have a very serious situation for low-lying areas such as this site.

If channel deepening happens, more water will flow in and out of the Bay on every tide, and there will be a huge extra volume of water to be acted upon by storm surges – and storms will occur more frequently as global warming increases. Groundwater will also rise. Coastline retreat and encroachment onto nearby land is a certainty – and it is not just me saying this, I am relying on **IPCC (International Panel on Climate Change) and CSIRO data.**

The following few photographs taken at McCrae beach in June of this year show how effective the sea is at encroaching onto the land, and causing damage to infrastructure.

Photos 20, 21, 22

On that day, 13th June, cars on Pt. Nepean Rd, a couple of hundred metres away from the proposed development were being drenched by waves – and it wasn't the worst storm we've had – ***and we haven't yet experienced the future effects of sea level rise or channel deepening!***

The boatshed has since been removed following further irreversible damage from the ongoing coastal processes.

Fifth: Landscape Setting Types for the Victorian Coast: aims for the area from Safety Beach to Portsea

Special considerations (page 23)

- Nepean Hwy and adjoining townships need to express a greater coastal character
- From the Melbourne side of this setting type, enhance the progression experience to the natural headland at Pt. Nepean and The Rip
- Careful siting and design of structures that influence coastal processes is necessary as the coastline is prone to erosion and sediment movements
- This area has high scenic quality and requires appropriate planning controls to protect this sensitive landscape

This proposal conflicts with these aims. Multi unit dwellings outside an existing township boundary won't help Dromana, McCrae or Rosebud townships to express a greater coastal character – quite the opposite! and the "progression experience" towards the Rip will be diminished by continued urban sprawl.

Sixth: Siting and Design Guidelines for Structures on the Victorian Coast advises:

3.2 Cultural and Aesthetic Guidelines (p 22)

*3.2.2 The form of a structure should maintain and enhance the established coastal landscape character of the area as expressed in the **dominant forms** of the surrounding environment.*

The proposal is not in keeping with the dominant form of dwellings between Anthony's Nose and McCrae Township, which is a mix of single and double storey beachside homes all occupying one lot per dwelling. The introduction of units into this area would set a precedent, destroying the intent of the Planning controls relevant to this unique area.

It is also worth noting that the two dwellings described by the Developer's Planner as 'three storey' at 605 and 609 Pt. Nepean Rd. are not actually three storeys. They are really two storey dwellings which, because of the topography of the land, 'unavoidably' gain the space underneath the main two-storey construction. I feel that the Developer's Planner may be embellishing the extent and type of development in the area, in the hope that we will decide that there is already some extensive developmentso why not just keep going with some more.

The Developer's Planner's argument that the proposed amendment does not set a precedent is unconvincing on two levels:

Firstly, because he argues elsewhere that the DDO3 has been broadly applied and that a review of the broader area is warranted

Secondly, he states the site is unique because it is vacant, flat and large. This could be true for any 2 properties between Anthony's Nose and Margaret St. if acquired by one owner. Many blocks along this strip are flat and large. Substantial houses are being demolished all around the Shire at present for 're-development opportunities', so any two adjoining blocks within the DDO3 could become large, flat and vacant if the current dwellings were demolished on them. If this amendment is approved, any two building blocks is a "unit development opportunity"

Seventh: Melbourne 2030

Melbourne 2030 applies the same principles for coastal management as the VCS 2002; hence what I've said about the VCS applies equally to Melbourne 2030. **The over-arching philosophy of the VCS and therefore Melbourne 2030 is to contain further development within existing township boundaries!** Along with the points made about the VCS, it is also noteworthy that one of the nine 'Directions' for *Melbourne 2030* is a **greener** Melbourne. If a precedent was set, and development continued to extend between Margaret St. and Anthony's Nose this would **make the area less green**. In fact anywhere that a developer challenged a DDO3 overlay and won, would result in less greenery for the Peninsula. High-density housing would inevitably reduce vegetation in the area by overuse and exploitation of the foreshore, and higher density housing means more coverage of the building site with hard surfaces, hence less vegetation.

The Developer's Planner suggests that **two of the nine** 'Directions' for Melbourne 2030 support this proposed amendment:

- ☐ Direction 1 A more Compact City
- ☐ Direction 5 A Great Place To Be

I suggest that if "**more compactness**" must be achieved, then it must be done in line with available development opportunities within existing township boundaries, as clearly expressed in numerous sections of our Planning Scheme, including Melbourne 2030 itself! Changing a small section of DDO3

to a DPO or DDO1 is an irrational response to this 'Direction' and does not display orderly, strategic planning. Regarding the Direction a '**Great Place To Be**' ... it won't be if it gets turned into 'urban infill' as proposed by the Developer and Council.

Clearly the guiding principles of Melbourne 2030 do not support this proposed amendment.

Eighth: Mt. Eliza to Pt. Nepean Coastal Action Plan (CAP): 2021 – Draft

The CAP describes 'Activity Nodes' major and minor along the coast, which are generally in accord with major townships or villages.

The CAP does not even record McCrae as a minor activity node.

The CAP also states the major strategic direction of the MSS is:

- ☐ *supports and strengthens the hierarchy of towns and villages on the Peninsula, having regard to their individual character and functions, their relationship to each other and to adjacent rural, coastal and port development areas*
- ☐ *recognises and protects strategic landscape areas between and around townships, due to their strong influence on the Peninsula's sense of place*

This proposal, and its inevitable flow on of **further linear development along Pt. Nepean Rd.** would severely reduce the individual character and function of McCrae village, and dilute any hierarchy and character of surrounding towns and villages.

Anthony's Nose and the McCrae cliff top is one of the few bluffs around the generally flat coastline of Port Phillip Bay. It is certainly a strategic landscape area, with a strong influence on the Peninsula's sense of place. This proposal would lead to a reduced visual amenity and enjoyment of this outstanding area.

- ☐ *The anticipated population increase over the next 20 years should be contained within defined areas of the Peninsula's major townships, including Mornington, Hastings, Somerville, Dromana/Safety Beach and Rosebud.*

Clearly McCrae is not included, and it is clear that creation of 'pocket sized' townships which extend linear growth between existing townships would conflict with this **important strategic direction**.

The CAP identifies a range of key issues, including:

- ☐ *The coastal environment from Mt. Eliza to Pt. Nepean is critical to the area's sense of place – a key part of why people live on and visit the Peninsula.*
- ☐ *In some areas the visual impact of nearby residential development is significant...the impact of structures upon the visual amenity and character*

of the coast, when seen from public viewing points, particularly the beach, is significant.

- *There is a need to protect, and in some cases define the ‘individual’ character of the various coastal villages located along Pt. Nepean Tourist Rd. **particularly from Dromana westwards to Sorrento/Portsea taking into consideration their functional roles.***

My comments are:

- Anthony’s Nose to McCrae village is critical to the area’s sense of place, as one of the few dramatic escarpments around the Bay.
- The proposed development, and any further linear developments as championed by the developer, would certainly be seen from the most public of all viewing points – **Pt. Nepean Tourist Rd.** which carries many thousands of cars per day. (During summer, extrapolating from previous Council surveys, around 25,000 cars per 8-hour day can pass the site).
- The proposal, and its obvious consequences would not protect the individual character of McCrae and Dromana, it would contribute to a decline in the visual and lifestyle amenity for residents and tourists.
- The CAP does not identify McCrae as a major or minor activity node, so it does not support the developer’s assertion that McCrae *requires this proposed amendment* to accommodate the supposed population surge in McCrae. It seems more likely that the developer wants to drive a population surge in McCrae.

Conclusion:

The proposed amendment and development is claimed to be of outstanding benefit to the community, but attempts to demonstrate this have failed, both in the development design itself and its assessment against the Planning Scheme and all its provisions. No real community benefit was demonstrated – only reduced amenity and some very serious negative environmental consequences.

Development opportunities exist within existing township boundaries, and the developer should explore these. It is reasonable for the community to expect that everybody will do their best to observe all the current statutes for the benefit of us all.

Granting this amendment would be an insult to the entire community, which only recently provided input into the Planning scheme with the benefit of the whole community, its liveability and our shared environment in mind.

It is almost unbelievable that in this world class unique coastal area, this proposed amendment and development, **unremarkable in every way**, can be being contemplated. A completely standard, unremarkable design is being offered to the community in return for our loss of privacy, amenity and lifestyle

in our much loved coastal area – ***the area we chose to live in because of the amenity, environment and landscape that it currently offers.***

If the developer was genuine in his desire to 'improve the amenity of the area' I would expect a design which was outstanding even in some small way. It is not. This is a further insult to the community. The developer seeks to exploit the generosity of the community for his private gain, but is unable to provide in return even innovative design. It is indeed insulting to be asked to accept further mediocrity on top of an ad hoc, pocket sized, illogical change to our visionary, equitable Planning Scheme.

I am sure the community does not want higher density housing in our area. If we wanted to live in a high-density setting we would have chosen to do so, not waited to have it imposed on us because of the investment desires of ONE developer. Unfortunately, the investment desires of one developer could initiate 'Hong Kong' style development here, as has occurred in other coastal locations around the world, to the vast detriment of those areas.

The Mornington Peninsula is known to be one of the most loved coastal locations around the world. Certainly it is the most visited tourist location in Victoria, and Council works hard to promote the many outstanding natural attractions of the area. 500,000 people visit Arthur's Seat every year! Even Dr. David Bellamy has stated that the Peninsula is world class - those of us who love it and live here don't need him to tell us that. Council itself has acknowledged this by its impressive efforts to be listed as the **first Urban Biosphere in the world!**

Last Photo – how the foreshore should look

Proposals such as this ad hoc amendment will only serve to kill the goose that laid the golden egg.

Len Warfe
Dromana
26th August 2003